



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,434	04/23/2002	Yin-Chun Huang	112.P14204	4966
43831 7590 10/16/2007 BERKELEY LAW & TECHNOLOGY GROUP, LLP 17933 NW Evergreen Parkway, Suite 250 BEAVERTON, OR 97006			EXAMINER GRANT II, JEROME	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/063,434	Applicant(s) HUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Jerome Grant II	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Anderson.

With respect to claim 1, Yamamoto teaches a method comprising: moving a document (paper 311) a first distance (dot width of 128 lines); scanning a portion of the document with a scanning head (carriage 303); moving the scanning head a second distance (a length of a word or the maximum width of the recording medium); Scanning another portion of the document (subsequent line of 128 total; and repeating the movement of the document and moving the scanning head a plurality of portions (plurality of lines totaling 128).

What Yamamoto fails to show is the 2nd distance of the scan is smaller than the distance of the paper movement. Applicant fails to proffer an advantage of moving the scan head a distance smaller than the distance the paper is fed. Yamamoto shows the reverse, namely the paper distance is the width of one dot (1 or 128 lines) and the scan head distance is a max of the width of the recording paper.

It appears that no particular advantage would have been achieved by setting the distance of the feed and scan head, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to set the feed and scan directions at a distance sufficient to achieve a scanning result while simultaneously feeding the paper as a matter of convenience or design choice.

With respect to claim 2, Yamamoto teaches this limitation with respect to left to right reading for each of the 128 lines.

With respect to claim 3, Yamamoto teaches this limitation via right to left movement to move the scanner carriage 303 to the home position.

With respect to claim 4, Yamamoto teaches the method is carried out in a sheet feeder, and wherein said sheet feeder includes a plurality of rollers (307 and 310) coupled to conveying guide (304) for moving the document.

With respect to claim 5, Yamamoto teaches all of the subject matter upon which the claim depends except for scanning window is larger than the distance the document is moved. Anderson teaches a document feed distance D1 which is from the area stacked on the tray to the position detected by sensor 53 while moving a scan carriage 31 a distance D2 where $D2 > D1$. Anderson shows use of a contact glass plate B. While Yamamoto is directed toward a serial scanner and Anderson is directed toward a flat bed scanner, it would have been obvious to modify scanner 402 of Yamamoto with a flat bed type with the glass on the top for making contact with a document for reading of the document as set forth by Anderson.

What Yamamoto fails to show is the 2nd distance of the scan is smaller than the distance of the paper movement. Applicant fails to proffer an advantage of moving the scan head a distance smaller than the distance the paper is fed. Yamamoto shows the reverse, namely the paper distance is the width of one dot (1 or 128 lines) and the scan head distance is a max of the width of the recording paper.

It appears that no particular advantage would have been achieved by setting the distance of the feed and scan head, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to set the feed and scan directions at a distance sufficient to achieve a

Art Unit: 2625

scanning result while simultaneously feeding the paper as a matter of convenience or design choice.

With respect to claim 6, Yamamoto teaches a method comprising: moving a document (paper 311) a first distance (dot width of 128 lines); scanning a portion of the document with a scanning head (carriage 303); moving the scanning head a second distance (a length of a word or the maximum width of the recording medium); Scanning another portion of the document (subsequent line of 128 total; and repeating the movement of the document and moving the scanning head a plurality of portions (plurality of lines totaling 128); Yamamoto teaches left to right reading for each of the 128 lines; and movement from right to left to bring the scanning carriage to the home position.

With respect to claim 7, the scanning head 303 moves left to right as to scan and right to left to move the scan carriage back to the home position.

With respect to claim 8, Yamamoto teaches scanning a first portion(a first word or 1/3 of the area of a width of a document) in a first document position (document advanced to line 1); moving the scanning head to a second head position (from left to right) at a point after a first word or first one-third of the line of a document; scanning a second portion of the side of the document (a second work or 2/3 area of the document; moving the document to a second document position (a 2nd line) relative to the scanning

Art Unit: 2625

window and scanning a third portion (a subsequent word or second-third of the side of the document (a third line) with the document in the second position (a 2nd of 128 lines for scanning).

With respect to claim 9, Yamamoto teaches wherein the scanning head is loaded in a third head position (a third word or last third of the line) when scanning the third portion (3/3 of the area of the document).

With respect to claim 10, Yamamoto teaches this limitation with respect to after the second position prior to the scanning of the third portion.

With respect to claim 11, With respect to claim 11, Yamamoto teaches a system comprising: a sheet feeder (ADF 15) capable of moving a document a first distance over a scanning window 13; a scanning head 31 capable of scanning a portion (1/3 area of the document) over said scanning window; a stepping motor (75) capable of moving

Art Unit: 2625

said scanning head a second distance in a first direction (left to right) and wherein said sheet feeder (15) is capable of moving the document a first distance (see figure 2).

What Yamamoto fails to show is the 2nd distance of the scan is smaller than the distance of the paper movement. Applicant fails to proffer an advantage of moving the scan head a distance smaller than the distance the paper is fed. Yamamoto shows the reverse, namely the paper distance is the width of one dot (1 or 128 lines) and the scan head distance is a max of the width of the recording paper.

It appears that no particular advantage would have been achieved by setting the distance of the feed and scan head, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to set the feed and scan directions at a distance sufficient to achieve a scanning result while simultaneously feeding the paper as a matter of convenience or design choice.

With respect to claim 12, Yamamoto teaches the sheet feeder is further capable of moving the document over the a scanning area and that the scanning carriage is moved a third portion (final or last of 1/3 area of the width of the document) wherein the stepping motor 75 moves the scanning head from right to left a second distance.

With respect to claim 13, Yamamoto teaches a scan head that moves from left to right then from right to left.

With respect to claim 14, Yamamoto teaches wherein the feeder comprises a conveying guide 15 and 16 and a plurality of rollers (inherent by ADF 15) which rotate for advancing the document.

With respect to claim 15, see figure 1 where distance D1 is the length from the edge of 17 to sensor 53.

With respect to claim 16, Yamamoto teaches ADF 15 for moving a document, scan carriage 303 for scanning a portion of the document; and motor 73 for moving the scanning means a second distance (1/3 the length of the document window 13) and means for scanning further including a means for scanning a second portion of said document over the scanning window and means 75 for moving the document over the scanning window 13.

What Yamamoto fails to show is the 2nd distance of the scan is smaller than the distance of the paper movement. Applicant fails to proffer an advantage of moving the scan head a distance smaller than the distance the paper is fed. Yamamoto shows the reverse, namely the paper distance is the width of one dot (1 or 128 lines) and the scan head distance is a max of the width of the recording paper.

It appears that no particular advantage would have been achieved by setting the distance of the feed and scan head, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to set the feed and scan directions at a distance sufficient to achieve a scanning result while simultaneously feeding the paper as a matter of convenience or design choice.

With respect to claim 17, Yamamoto teaches a means 75 for scanning a third portion (last 1/3 of the length of the document); and means 73 for moving the scanning carriage 303.

With respect to claim 18, Yamamoto teaches means 73 for moving said means for scanning back and forth in a scanning direction to scan the document from left to right for scanning and from right to left for moving the carriage to the home position.

With respect to claim 19, see figure 1 of Yamamoto.

With respect to claim 20, Anderson teaches a method comprising: moving a document (via 75) a first distance (first 1/4th of the length of the document) placed over a scanning region; with a scanning head (31) scanning a portion of the document ; moving the scanning head a second distance (2nd 1/4 of the length of a document); scanning a second portion of said document (2nd 1/4th of length of the document) over

Art Unit: 2625

the scanning window; moving the document further over the scanning window via 75; and scanning head 31 for scanning a third portion (3rd ¼ portion of the length of the document).

What Yamamoto fails to show is the 2nd distance of the scan is smaller than the distance of the paper movement. Applicant fails to proffer an advantage of moving the scan head a distance smaller than the distance the paper is fed. Yamamoto shows the reverse, namely the paper distance is the width of one dot (1 or 128 lines) and the scan head distance is a max of the width of the recording paper.

It appears that no particular advantage would have been achieved by setting the distance of the feed and scan head, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to set the feed and scan directions at a distance sufficient to achieve a scanning result while simultaneously feeding the paper as a matter of convenience or design choice.

With respect to claim 21, Anderson teaches the scanning head 31 said second distance in a said first direction again; and scanning a fourth portion (1st of the 1/4th area of the document) via 75.

Art Unit: 2625

With respect to claim 22, Anderson teaches scanning head back and forth (via 73) as claimed. See also the scanning direction arrow in figure 2.

With respect to claim 24, see figure 2.

With respect to claim 26, Yamamoto teaches all of the subject matter upon which the claims depend except for the intermittent reading of a document such that subsequent scanning distances are less than the first scan.

However, applicant doesn't proffer an advantage of scanning in the manner, prescribed nor is it clear how this would solve a problem in the art. Hence, the length appears arbitrary and subsequent to either a matter of convenience or obviousness in view of an error in the system occurring such that the 2nd distance is less than the first.

2.

Claims Objected to As Containing Allowable Matter

Claim 25 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

3.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Grant II whose telephone number is 571-272-7463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles, can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Grant II

